

**FEB 20 2007****REMARKS**

With claims 1, 3-4, and 6-16 pending, with this amendment, claims 1, 3, 6, 12 and 15 have been amended as discussed in more detail below.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 3 stands objected to because of the following informalities indicated in the Office Action, namely the Office Action states: "Claim 3, line 7 recites 'with each of said plurality of radials, said data items ...'. This claim limitation should recite 'with each of said plurality of radials, said data item.'" In response, Applicant has removed the term "said data items" from the claim. Accordingly, claim 3 is now believed unobjectionable.

**Section 112, First Paragraph Rejection**

Claims 1, 3, 6, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as being non-enabling. The Office Action states that claims 1, 3, 6, 12 and 15 have steps that are considered critical or essential, but are not included in the claims.

Regarding claim 1, the Office Action suggests that this claim would be better recited as "identifying in a computer, a centroid from a map database based on a user input search request; defining a plurality of radials extending from said centroid from the map database based on the user input search request; associating at least one data item having an addressable location with each of said plurality of radials, said item being stored in a memory ...; ... (needs step to tie the claim limitation)." In response, Applicant has amended the claim language to comply with the Office Action suggestions. A step of "displaying the centroid and the radials on a map grid" has further been added as a tying limitation as requested. Accordingly, claim 1 is now believed in condition for allowance as enabling under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Regarding claim 3, the Office Action indicates that this recites "locating positions on a respective radial, each said position corresponding to one of the addressable locations; associating each said position to one of the addressable locations on the respective radial; placing a marker at each located position of the displayed respective radial; and (needs another step here once the marker is placed and the located position is displayed of the respective radial)." In response, Applicant has

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

amended the claim language to add an additional step to comply with the Office Action suggestions. Namely, a step of "displaying the centroid, the radials, and the markers on a map grid" has further been added.

Regarding independent claims 3, 6, 12 and 15, the Office Action states they have a similar problem to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3, 6, 12 and 15 have been amended in a similar manner to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3, 6, 12 and 15 are now believed in condition for allowance as enabling under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Further claims 4, 7-11, 13, 14 and 16 are believed allowable based on the amendments to individual ones of claims 3, 6, 12 and 15 on which they depend.

### Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Office Action indicates claim 1 recites "a map database" and "a user input search request," but nothing else is being done with the "map database" and after the "user input search request" in the other claim limitations. The Office Action indicates this makes it unclear what happens in the remaining limitations.

In response, applicant has used both terms "map database" and "user input search request" in other claim limitations to clarify the claim language. Based on the above amendments and remarks, all claims of the present application are now believed allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

FEB 20 2007

**Conclusion**

Based on the above remarks, all of pending claims 1, 3-4, and 6-16 are believed in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 20, 2007By: Thomas A. Ward  
Thomas A. Ward  
Reg. No. 35,732

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928